



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/506,676	02/17/2000	David E. Kronk	FLO1372-026	6566
4955	7590	06/24/2005	EXAMINER	
WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP BRADFORD GREEN BUILDING 5 755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224 MONROE, CT 06468			WON, MICHAEL YOUNG	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2155		
DATE MAILED: 06/24/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/506,676	KRONK, DAVID E.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Y. Won	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 12/10/04 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 21-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 21 and 29 have been amended.
2. Claims 21-31 have been re-examined and are pending with this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 21-26 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Smith et al. (US 6192282 B1).

As per claims 21 and 29, Smith teaches a system (see abstract) and a method (see col.2, lines 47-49) for controlling a plurality of outdoor environmental maintenance equipment (see Fig.1 and col.10, lines 30-35) having different user interfaces based on an open client-server architecture (see col.2, lines 62-65) for golf courses, ski resorts, other outdoor recreational areas or for any application involving and managing of an outdoor environment (see Fig.1, #19: "outside air, weather station", #21: "outdoor lights", #23: "sprinklers, pool", #25: "outdoor a/v"), comprising: client or user interfaces for providing messages for controlling the plurality of outdoor environmental maintenance equipment, and receiving responses containing information about the plurality of environmental maintenance equipment (see col.3, lines 51-57); client or user interface messaging controls, each associated with a respective one of the client or user interfaces (see col.3, lines 54-57; col.44, lines 48-53; and Fig.2B, #13); interface control servers, each for controlling a respective one of the plurality of outdoor environmental maintenance equipment (see col.46, lines 18-46); and interface control server messaging controls, each associated with a respective one of the interface control servers (see col.3, lines 14-17 and Fig.1, #13), the interface control server messaging controls and the client or user interface messaging controls exchanging messages and communicating with each other (see col.3, lines 51-60; col.4, lines 3-16; and col.15, line 64 to col.16, line 12) using a common messaging control protocol for controlling the plurality of outdoor environmental maintenance equipment (see col.64, lines 1-5), each messaging control being usable for communication with at least two or more other messaging controls in the system (see col.4, lines 3-16; col.10, lines 8-9; col.13, lines

20-22; col.14, lines 6-9; and col.15, lines 14-20 & 48-50) so that each client or user interface can provide messages for controlling each of the plurality of outdoor environmental maintenance equipment, and also can receive responses containing information about each of the plurality of outdoor environmental maintenance equipment (see col.3, lines 51-60).

As per claims 22 and 30, Smith further teaches wherein the common messaging control protocol is transmission control protocol/Internet protocol (TCP/IP) (see col.20, lines 35-44).

As per claims 23 and 31, Smith further teaches wherein the common messaging control protocol is text messaging (see col.12, lines 42-51 and col.48, lines 29-32).

As per claim 24, Smith further teaches wherein each interface control servers communicate with a respective interface control server messaging control using interprocessing (see col.3, line 65) calls/events (see col.4, lines 3-11; col.5, lines 13-20 col.16, lines 15-26 & 24-26; and 45, lines 56-59).

As per claim 25, Smith further teaches wherein the at least one client or user interface, the at least one client or user interface messaging control, the interface control servers, interface control server messaging controls, or a combination thereof, form part of different domains including either a personal computer (PC), a local area network (LAN), the world wide web (WWW), or a combination thereof (see col.20, lines 45-54 and Fig.2A to Fig.3).

As per claim 26, Smith further teaches wherein the plurality of outdoor environmental maintenance equipment includes an irrigation system, a pump station, a

weather station or other environmental maintenance equipment (see Fig.1; col.10, lines 30-35; and col.18, lines 10-21).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (US 6192282 B1) in view of Gray et al. (US 5568402 A).

As per claim 27, Smith does not explicitly teach wherein the client or user interface includes a system control and data acquisition (SCADA) having a messaging control arranged therein. Gray teaches of client or user interface includes a system control and data acquisition (SCADA) having a messaging control arranged therein (see). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Gray within the system of Smith by implementing (SCADA) having a messaging control arranged therein within a system for controlling a plurality of environmental maintenance equipment based on an open client-server architecture because Smith teaches that the invention may be implemented in "a

centralized processing environment or a distributed processing environment" (see Smith: col.2, lines 50-51) and Gray teaches that "In a SCADA system, data respectively gathered by a plurality of remote stations is supplied to a master station and supervisory control is performed on the basis of this data" (see Gray: col.1, lines 13-19). Therefore, since Smith teaches that in a distributed system, the automated subsystems are under the control of a local controller and a central controller (see Smith: col.44, lines 48-53), one of ordinary skill in the art would implement SCADA.

As per claim 28, Smith does not explicitly teach wherein the client or user interface includes one or more site managers, each having a messaging control arranged therein. Gray teaches of wherein the client or user interface includes one or more site managers, each having a messaging control arranged therein (see). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Gray within the system of Smith by implementing site managers, each having a messaging control arranged therein within a system for controlling a plurality of environmental maintenance equipment based on an open client-server architecture because Gray teaches that site manager within a local device "controls the starting and maintaining the transfer of data within the communications channel by the channel drivers" (see Gray: col.3, lines 54-56) and Smith teaches that his system employs plurality of channels in which "one or more communication channels must be selected to serve as "buses" to allow communication between the automated subsystems (see col.44, lines 48-51), therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would employ site managers for controlling communication of messages.

Response to Arguments

5. In response to applicant's arguments, Smith clearly teaches the amended limitation "so that each client or user interface can provide messages for controlling each of the plurality of outdoor environmental maintenance equipment, and also can receive responses containing information about each of the plurality of outdoor environmental maintenance equipment". In column 3, lines 51-60, Smith teach of a "plurality of user interfaces" which is "communicatively coupled through **particular one** of the plurality of building automation subsystems". Smith teaches that such interfaces are used to "receive user inputs and display system status". To assume that "only Smith's centralized intelligent home controller 13 can control all of the numerous subsystems" is an improper generalization of referenced invention. Whether the invention is centralized or decentralized is not two distinct inventions within the Smith patent, but rather the utility of the invention. Clearly Smith teaches that the implementation is interchangeable (see col.2, lines 49-51).

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Y. Won whose telephone number is 571-272-3993. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th: 7AM-5PM.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael Won



Bharat Barot
BHARAT BAROT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

June 8, 2005